

	YES	NO
52. Result in the use of any publicly-owned land from a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge?		X*
<u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>		
53. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
54. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)		X
55. Does the project have environmental effects which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. It includes the effects of other projects which interact with this project and, together, are considerable.		X
56. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

(VI) Discussion of Environmental Evaluation

Result in any noise levels or vibration for adjoining areas or result in any noise criteria being equal or exceeded? (#19& #20)

Alternative B would result in noise increases to certain residents such that a soundwall would be feasible to reduce noise impacts. Under Alternative B noise levels would increase at eleven locations and approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) at eight locations. On the north side of proposed alternate B, constructing a 10 ft (3 m) high, 405 ft (124 m) long soundwall would benefit six residences by mitigating noise levels to below the NAC. On the south side a soundwall would not be reasonable because of cost. The reasonableness criteria allows an expenditure of \$38,000 per benefited residence. Since only two residences on the south side would benefit, sound wall construction could not exceed \$76,000. The actual cost of the soundwall however, would be approximately \$112,000 which would significantly exceed the allowable cost.

For Alternatives A1 and C the noise levels would not approach or exceed the NAC and no mitigation is required.

Affect life-styles, neighborhood character or minority groups (#34 & #35)

Alternatives B and C would both require right of way occupied by La Mexicana market, a small Hispanic-owned grocery store. Many of the store's customers could be members of the local Hispanic population. This market and the project area are located within U.S. Census Block Group 1 in Glenn County Census Tract 101. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, 30% of the 1,600 people in this block group were of Hispanic origin. This represents a fairly high concentration of members of this ethnic minority, particularly compared with the 20% found in the County as a whole.

This information indicates a probability that the relocations required for Alternatives B and C would disproportionately impact low-income and minority populations. These impacts would require mitigation, according to Executive Order 12898. Executive Order 12898 requires Federal agencies to achieve environmental justice by identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. A focused community outreach on the displaced residents and their involvement in the relocation process is ongoing.

Require the displacement of businesses or people (#37 & #38)

Alternatives B and C would require the displacement of residents and businesses. Alternative B would take four residences and four businesses. Alternative C would result in the taking of six residences including one multi-family residence and the full or partial take of four businesses. The Caltrans Draft Relocation Impact Report confirms that there are sufficient comparable housing and business sites available.

Affect property values or the local tax base (#39)

The two realignment alternatives could have a positive or negative affect on property values. Because the path of Route 32 would change under alternatives B and C, certain parcels would be subject to an increase or decrease in traffic circulation. The project area has residences living in areas that are zoned commercial. These properties might become more attractive to commercial buyers with the new access to Route 32, conversely certain residents may not appreciate being closer to the road. Other residences that were previously directly on Route 32 would benefit by being further away from it. Thus, there could be effects on property values or the local tax base, but these effects would not necessarily be detrimental.

Alter present patterns of circulation (#42)

Alternative A1, an improvement of the existing alignment, should not result in changes in traffic circulation.

Alternatives B and C would result in minor alterations in the circulation of traffic. (see exhibits B and C) Under both alternatives, eastbound traffic on Walker Street would not be able to enter the intersection of Walker and Sixth Streets. Seventh Street would also be changed by those alternatives. Under alternative B part of Seventh Street north of Walker would be closed and under alternative C, traffic on Seventh Street would not be able to make left hand turns on to Walker Street.

Traffic on Swift Street in the project area would be greatly reduced as it would no longer be part of SR 32. The segment of Sixth between Walker and Swift would also see a reduction in traffic.